

Subject: Yuriy Alexandrovich born in 1915 in Ukraine,
Ukraine, U.S.S.R.

Subject: U.S.S.R.

Date: 2 Nov 1964

1. Subject is Professor of Russian and Soviet literatures, and as a guest lecturer arrived by plane to this country early October 1964. He held a series of lectures on literature at NEU and Columbia in New York, at Georgetown University in Washington, DC, and at California University. He left New York by plane on 30 Oct 1964 for Moscow.

Subject is Ukrainian though prefers not to "expose" his nationality. Aged 49, born in Kyiv; party member, married, his wife is the son, they have two daughters, the younger one is 11 years old. With his younger daughter he used to go to Ukraine to give her opportunity to get acquainted with the Ukrainian people and to learn Ukrainian language.

Subject married when he was 24 years old. At the same age he received his PhD degree. He also is author of several books and treatises on literature.

He is lecturer on Russian literature at Moscow University and is also in the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Department at the Institute of Literature in New Academy of Sciences, U.S.S.R., Moscow. Subject also contributed to "Druzhba Narodov" published in Moscow, writing mostly on Ukrainian and Byelorussian literatures. As prof of literature he earns RR 500.- per month. With his family and a daughter, they occupy a 4-room apartment and pay the 12.-month rent.

Subject's description he is well off, has very fine, well rounded features quite heavy and broad. There he lived for over 20 years and prior to that he lived 10 years or so in Kiev. He served with the army "but not far away".

As a rule he speaks only Ukrainian. His English is poor. A

everything Soviet

7. KONSTANT VON

Physical description

His hobby: cultivating of flowers.

2. Source met Subject for the first time on 7 Oct 1964 at 11:00 a.m.

On 8 Oct 1964, Source picked up Subject at his hotel at 11:30 AM. Source

On 15 Oct 1964, instead of going to museums they did window shopping, and also ~~much~~ small shopping from 11.50 to 14.30 hrs. They went to Harvard and Woolworth, Subject bought 2 balloons for his young daughter and his friends, a notebook for himself, and some other small stationery. He was quite impressed by both - Woolworth and Chopwell where they are. He also went for a walk in ~~the~~ Central Park.

On 16 Oct 1964 Source gave Subject 9 books. He brought them to his hotel and Subject gladly accepted them. Looking through some of them he remarked that he knew of Prof SHEPHERD and was of a very high opinion about him.

On 20 Oct 1964 Subject left for Washington, DC, and then proceeded to California. On 28 Oct 1964 he returned to New York, gave a lecture on Soviet Ukrainian Literature same evening at the NYU, and on 30 Oct 1964 left by plane for Moscow. On 20 Oct when picking him up at the hotel Shelton, Source gave Subject 5 more books. He was however not very happy about them but did not refuse. On that day he was in very bad mood on the whole; he did not sleep last night on his way to New York, he was informed at the last moment about his lecture at ~~NYU~~ NYU and had to make himself a decision about it. He had an appointment at the hotel with "his friend" from the Soviet UN Mission at the same time as the seminar at NYU, but decided to go to the latter. He left his friend a note saying to meet him on a corner near NYU (Source told him the place) and after the lecture Source accompanied him to his friend at that place. Subject's friend arrived by car together with his wife. The friend - aged 40-45, round Slavic face, blond, blue eyes. Subject did not introduce Source to his friend.

On all occasions Source met Subject, he was always with him. In the beginning he used to talk much about political, cultural, scientific, cultural and economic development of the nations, e.g. later on, though still adhering to official party line, he became "more open" and even criticized some aspects of Soviet reality.

SECRET



-2-

SECRET

3. Subject was a friendly to me and into "SECRET" they traveled together to GSE, January, 1942. Subject visited in 1943 when in 1944. Subject likes New-city and once recorded that "I know in other of all in plan cities when they in their nation".

4. Subject known personally ANTONIO-DAVIDOVICH. According to subject ANTONIO-DAVIDOVICH had suffered very much during Stalinism and became very nervous. Now, no one accuses him of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism and he lives quietly in Moscow. After his return from Siberia he recuperated almost completely except for his nervousness. He has a son Degeni who was born already after his return from deportation.

5. Subject described STEINBERG, photo on the page 11 and 12 and one of the best Ukrainian revolutionaries of the period.

6. Subject promised to read for me a translation by the Soviet Union. It was a book titled "Vnesvit" which in his opinion was one of the best. It was written for the Soviet Union.

SECRET

Topics Discussed (Excerpts)

7 Oct 1967

1. Contemporary Ukrainian Literature

According to Subject contemporary Ukrainian literature is by no means weaker than the Russian one. Only due to "objective circumstances" are in the USSR Evushenko and Rozhdachynsky were more known in the West than Drahun, Kostouko. As other great talents among young Ukrainian generation Subject mentioned Vlasynovskiy, Kovalenko, Dziuba. Subject was of negative opinion about KOROTYCH whom he described as "a little talented poet who by all means wants to get into literature using for that purpose his morality".

DZUBA - suffers from TB and is in a sanatorium. There he is writing a history of Ukrainian literature.

2. Post-war Emigration

Subject does not like post war emigres because they are absorbed with Communism. When Source pointed out that according to Shushchov's speech of 1954 as Korotychuk had presented it in his "Wings", the NKVD for or had ordered all army people to leave their homes during the war, Subject recalled that beside Shushchov's speech at the 20th Congress, the emigres should have also published his speech of 1954 directed against Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism.

Subject did not want to discuss this topic.

3. Identification

There is no possible identification in the Soviet Union or in the USSR. Subject mentioned other cities of Ukraine, but not on the first and last page. He was living long in the USSR, but he did not want to discuss this topic.

SECRET

4. Shayshakho Garaniyan in Rancy

Subject to report in the above mentioned collection in Rancy in 1964. There were at least 15,000 peasants alone. He said that many people from local and therefore local radio stations had gathered. "I did not go to the Rancy. I would have come to Rancy in order to have been in the collection".

When asked about subject that he had seen, he said that there were 10,000 members in the collection, subject charged at the time.

5. The Arson in Rancy Library

According to Subject the arson in the library in May 1964 was committed by a man called Mr. Individual, "former employee of the library". He was fired from his job and sent to hospital when this happened. Then, after some time, he was re-employed by the library. One of the things he mentioned in the library was a long film strip in several rooms and limited in. It was said to be a burned down.

6. Publications at the Academy of Sciences, Moscow

Subject and his colleagues can read literature or papers or information in the library in Moscow. "Of course it is not possible to read all the information".

7. Soviet-Chinese Conflict

This was a serious matter. Subject did not think the conflict was serious. He said it was a really great potential issue to be handled. He said that the Chinese have solved our problems. He said that the Chinese have solved our problems. He said that the Chinese have solved our problems. He said that the Chinese have solved our problems.

8. April 1964

1. March 1964

SECRET

When they were not for the first time in the collection. He said that the Chinese have solved our problems. He said that the Chinese have solved our problems. He said that the Chinese have solved our problems.

development of individual Soviet nations he did not think it feasible for
next decades. Above all how the respective concept was conceived. Prior
to 22nd Congress the Academy of Sciences had received a request from the
Central Committee of the Party to make a research on feasibility of future
amalgamation of Soviet nations. Many scientists were involved and international
- as in many cases - they did not exclude such a possibility. This was put into
the form of a concept and later on proclaimed at the 22nd Congress. But the re-
life proved very soon that it was going its own ways. Revival of individual
national cultures had to be taken into account and the party could not overlook
it. Consequently, the party let the life itself determine the fate of this
concept. Because even when non-Russian prefer to send their children to common
schools this does not make them Russians.

As "similar cases" that were conceived by the Academy of Sciences but
already on its own initiative. Subject mentioned the quarrel on the subject
of "Slove o Zlatko Iperovin". Prof ZHIN or ZELIN conceived a new theory
trying to prove that "Slove" was a falsification of XVIII C and that's all. A sin,
many scholars debated for many months but finally it was proved that ZHIN was
wrong.

Asked about some really similar cases to that of the concept of amalgamation
of nations, subject only replied that "it was quite normal that the party (the
committee with our Academic staff" but he refused to elaborate.

7. What happened to Shapshchey?

Subject did not think that anything really wrong might happen to
Shapshchey. He will probably join his former friends Sholotov, Tolstoy and
others. Subject saw Sholotov recently in Moscow and, in translation, was
employed as chief engineer at construction of hydro-electric stations.

8. Uniform Question

Subject did not think that anything really wrong might happen to Shapshchey.

SECRET

personally liked ^{the} late Kennedy because he really respected Lenin's ideas and collaborated with them. He is of a very low opinion about the Soviet scientific approach to life's problems.

5. Costs of Life in Moscow

In Subject's opinion life in Moscow is cheaper than in New York. He could not afford to buy so much in New York as he does in Moscow for less than \$500. When pressed on this point Subject began to talk about ^{free} medical care, social security also in the Soviet Union which are - in his view - not available in this country.

23 Oct 1964

1. Subject's Lecture on Contemporary Ukrainian Literature

Subject rejected any idea of amalgamation of literatures of various peoples and stressed again the necessity to study not only his own but also Ukrainian and other literatures. He began with reference to some questions he came across while in this country as to future of Soviet literature and as a result could only recommend widening of Russian studies also on non-Russian domains. To broaden the Western student will know ^{only} a part of Soviet literature, i.e. only the Russian literature.

Then he started with proper subject matter. The novel is in the best present position in the contemporary Ukrainian literature, as an outlet for national tradition and culture above all. Among its representatives he mentioned first of all SHEVCHUK whose style is highly Ukrainian and whose novel "Human Blood is Hot Water" and others he would rate with best Soviet Union works in the Soviet Union.

Subject is a friend of SHEVCHUK and likes him very much. He is a very good writer and a very good person.

are
On the whole there are two lines of development of contemporary Ukrainian literature, lyric - as represented by HONCHAR, DOVZHENKO and MELNIK; and strictly realistic - as represented mainly by TRUCHEN.

Subject mentioned also young poets and writers, in particular KOSTENKO and DRACH. In his view all the attacks against them were not justified because they were talented young people who even did influence their older ~~colleagues~~ colleagues. He had in mind DRACH'S influence on RAZIAN. Although he (Subject) personally did not like everything that was written by DRACH and KOSTENKO, nevertheless he appreciates very much their fresh and novel contribution to the treasures of Ukrainian literature.

2. Changes in the Kremlin

Subject was still reluctant to make any comments. He reminded him to saying that in his view this was a change for better "in all respects". Asked what consequences it will have for non-Russian readers, Subject replied also that "they will have better".

Ad. B's Lecture on Ukrainian literature: In the direction that followed B's lecture he was asked, among other things, what are the chances for rehabilitation of Khvylovyl and Drai-Khmara. His reply was that he did not know and almost all depended on workers of national archives. But since in the past time some anti-communist writers were already rehabilitated the chances might be in it Khvylovyl and Drai-Khmara.

SECRET

List of Books given to Subject

16 Oct 1964

1. Dokumenty Ukrainckoho Komunistu 1
2. Vyvid Prav Ukrainy 1
3. Ukrainckie Nauka v Koloniyalnyi Puti 1
4. Suchasna Literatura v USSR (Kocholivets) 1
5. Suchasnist' # 8/1964 1
6. Rozstavleno Vidrozdennia 1
7. Sopen' - by Kalaniuk 1
8. Zbirnyk na poshanu Zenona Kuzala, UMAN 1962 1
9. Marys Suchasnoyi Ukrainckoyi Ikvy - by Shchepel 1

28 Oct 1964

10. Suchasnist' # 9/1964 1
11. Obirvani Struny 1
12. Poesiye - by Drai-Khmar 1
13. Istoriya Ukr. literatury - Radnykovych 1
14. Lektsiia Dal 1